REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7-16, 19-24 and 26-39 are pending in above-identified application. Claims 5, 6 and 25 have been incorporated into claim 1. Support for new claims 36-39 is found in original claims 14, 16, 31 and 32.

Issues under 35 USC 112

Claims 1-35 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the use of the terms "predetermined" and "strongly" have been objected to. First, it is respectfully submitted that the use of the term "predetermined" is appropriate and does not render the claims indefinite. Secondly, it is submitted that the use of the term "strongly" in claim 2 is appropriate, since examples of strongly coordinating donors are described in the present specification and recited in other dependent claims. It is noted with regard to claim 29 that the objectionable term "bulk" has been removed from the claim. Consequently, it is requested that the above-noted rejection be withdrawn.

Issues under 35 USC 102(e)

Claims 1-35 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Thorman '468 (USP 7,078,468). This rejection is traversed based on the following reasons.

Thorman '468 discloses a polymerization catalyst system which employs external donors, such as cyclohexylmethyldimethoxysilane (CMDS), in conjunction with a Ziegler-Natta catalyst system in order to make polypropylene as noted at columns 1-2. As discussed in the Office Action of November 21, 2007, Thorman '468 discloses at columns 7-10 and Table II the results of polymerization data and comparisons. These results include the use of the donor CMDS and the donor diisobutyldimethoxysilane (DIBDS). Examples 1 and 3 employ CMDS with an H_2 concentration of 0.08, while Examples 9 and 11 employ DIBDS with an H_2 concentration of 0.09. The melt flow rate (MF) is 1.7, 3.0, 2.9 and 4.2 for Examples 1, 3, 9 and 11, respectively.

Thorman '468 fails to disclose the process of the present invention wherein the hydrogen feed is maintained within at most 5% by volume while advantageously maintaining an essentially constant MFR. Note that the difference in hydrogen concentration between Examples 1 and 3 as compared to 9 and 11 is greater than 10%, as well as the fact that the MF varies somewhat significantly. Consequently, it is submitted that significant patentable distinctions exist between the present invention and Thorman '468 such that the above-noted rejection should be withdrawn.

It is submitted for the reasons above that the present claims define patentable subject matter such that this application should now be placed in condition for allowance.

If any questions arise in the above matters, please contact Applicant's representative, Andrew D. Meikle (Reg. No. 32,868), in the Washington Metropolitan Area at the phone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Andrew D. Meikle
Registration No.: 32,868
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant